B7

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/550,038	04/14/2000	Susumu Okada	32584	9156

116 7590 09/29/2004

PEARNE & GORDON LLP
1801 EAST 9TH STREET
SUITE 1200
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108

EXAMINER	
JERABEK, KELLY L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2612	

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/550,038	OKADA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kelly L. Jerabek	2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 June 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-13 and 15-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *5-9,11,13 and 15-21* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,10,12 and 22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/15/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Response to Remarks:

Applicant contends (Amendment, page 15) that the Morgan reference does not teach "choosing a camera to be panned based on examining the angle between the desired direction and the current direction of each camera". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Morgan discloses in figure 2 a user interface for a camera selection and positioning system. Images are taken by remote cameras (fig. 1: 34,36) and displayed on video monitors (fig. 1: 22,24,26,28) (col. 3, lines 20-33). A camera control area display section (fig. 2: 30) displays camera symbols (fig. 2: 24,3,32) representing the locations of the cameras and wedges (fig. 2: 64,68) indicating the directions in which the cameras are oriented (col. 5, lines 11-20). The map (fig. 2: 50) has a coordinate pattern that corresponds to areas of the touch screen (30). When the user touches an area on the screen a camera is selected for optimal shooting of the designated location (col. 5, lines 16-21). **When the selected camera is not in not already pointed at the designated location it will rotate towards the location (col. 5, lines 18-21). Thus,**

the camera is panned. It is true that in automatic mode the camera is chosen based on which camera is closed to the desired target. However, the claim language only states that the camera-to-be-operated determination section **determines a camera to be panned** on the basis of an angle between an imaginary line connecting the center of the camera symbol with the designated location and an imaginary line connecting the center of the camera symbol with the direction in which the camera is currently oriented. The Examiner is interpreting the claim as meaning that a determination is made as to whether or not a selected camera needs to be panned on the basis of an angle between an imaginary line connecting the center of the camera symbol with the designated location and an imaginary line connecting the center of the camera symbol with the direction in which the camera is currently oriented. The Morgan reference states that the wedge (64) indicates the field of view of the camera (62) and if it is not already pointed at the asset (a.k.a. on the basis of an angle between an imaginary line connecting the center of the camera symbol with the designated location and an imaginary line connecting the center of the camera symbol with the direction in which the camera is currently oriented), it will start to rotate towards it (a.k.a. camera will be panned)(col. 5, lines 18-20). Thus, the Morgan reference reads on claim 1.

Applicant contends (Amendment, page 15) that there is no teaching in the reference that a camera is chosen based on an angle between two imaginary lines. The Examiner agrees with this assertion, however, claim 1 as written does not state that a camera is chosen based on an angle between two imaginary lines. The claim

language only states that the camera-to-be-operated determination section **determines a camera to be panned** on the basis of an angle between an imaginary line connecting the center of the camera symbol with the designated location and an imaginary line connecting the center of the camera symbol with the direction in which the camera is currently oriented. The Examiner is interpreting the claim as meaning that a determination is made as to whether or not a selected camera needs to be panned on the basis of an angle between an imaginary line connecting the center of the camera symbol with the designated location and an imaginary line connecting the center of the camera symbol with the direction in which the camera is currently oriented. The Morgan reference states that the wedge (64) indicates the field of view of the camera (62) and if it is not already pointed at the asset (a.k.a. on the basis of an angle between an imaginary line connecting the center of the camera symbol with the designated location and an imaginary line connecting the center of the camera symbol with the direction in which the camera is currently oriented), it will start to rotate towards it (a.k.a. camera will be panned)(col. 5, lines 18-20). Thus, the Morgan reference reads on claim 1.

Applicant contends (Amendment, page 16) that there is no suggestion in the Morgan reference that the zoom scale is calculated for each of the cameras that are optimal or that this is done in a sequence in which the cameras are arranged. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Morgan discloses in figure 2 a user interface for a camera selection and positioning system. Images are taken by remote cameras (fig. 1: 34,36) and displayed on video monitors (fig. 1: 22,24,26,28) (col. 3, lines 20-33). A

camera control area display section (fig. 2: 30) displays camera symbols (fig. 2: 24,3,32) representing the locations of the cameras and wedges (fig. 2: 64,68) indicating the directions in which the cameras are oriented (col. 5, lines 11-20). The map (fig. 2: 50) has a coordinate pattern that corresponds to areas of the touch screen (30). When the user touches an area on the screen a camera is selected for optimal shooting of the designated location (col. 5, lines 16-21). **Morgan also states that camera selection is determined by an algorithm that first identifies which camera or cameras can "see" the desired area (col. 6, lines 39-41). It is inherent that the algorithm must to through a sequence according to the arrangement of the cameras in order to examine each of the cameras and determine which cameras can "see" the desired area.** Zoom information is then calculated for each selected camera to present a constant view height (col. 6, lines 39-52). Therefore, since camera selection is determined by an algorithm that identifies which cameras can "see" the desired area and zoom information is then calculated for each selected camera it can be seen that the zoom scale of each camera examined as being optimal for shooting (a.k.a. the cameras that can "see" the desired area) is determined in a sequence in which the cameras are arranged.

Applicant contends (Amendment, page 16) that the Morgan reference does not teach the limitation "when cameras optimal for shooting the designated location are selected, images captured by the cameras are displayed at respective scales in a sequence in which the cameras are arranged". The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Morgan discloses in figure 2 a user interface for a camera selection and positioning system. Images are taken by remote cameras (fig. 1: 34,36) and displayed on video monitors (fig. 1: 22,24,26,28) (col. 3, lines 20-33). A camera control area display section (fig. 2: 30) displays camera symbols (fig. 2: 24,3,32) representing the locations of the cameras and wedges (fig. 2: 64,68) indicating the directions in which the cameras are oriented (col. 5, lines 11-20). The map (fig. 2: 50) has a coordinate pattern that corresponds to areas of the touch screen (30). When the user touches an area on the screen a camera is selected for optimal shooting of the designated location (col. 5, lines 16-21). When the selected camera is not in not already pointed at the designated location it will rotate towards the location (col. 5, lines 18-21). Thus, the camera is panned. **Morgan also states that camera selection is determined by an algorithm that first identifies which camera or cameras can "see" the desired area (col. 6, lines 39-41). It is inherent that the algorithm must to through a sequence according to the arrangement of the cameras in order to examine each of the cameras and determine which cameras can "see" the desired area.** These camera views are immediately routed to available video monitors (col. 6, lines 41-42). Therefore, since camera selection is determined by an algorithm that identifies which cameras can "see" the desired area and the selected camera views are immediately routed to available video monitors it can be seen that images captured by each camera examined as being optimal for shooting (a.k.a. the cameras that can "see" the desired area) are displayed at respective scales in a sequence in which the cameras are arranged.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,3-4,10,12, and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Morgan US 4,992,866.

Re claim 1, Morgan discloses in figure 2 a user interface for a camera selection and positioning system. Images are taken by remote cameras (fig. 1: 34,36) and displayed on video monitors (fig. 1: 22,24,26,28) (col. 3, lines 20-33). A camera control area display section (fig. 2: 30) displays camera symbols (fig. 2: 24,3,32) representing the locations of the cameras and wedges (fig. 2: 64,68) indicating the directions in which the cameras are oriented (col. 5, lines 11-20). The map (fig. 2: 50) has a coordinate

pattern that corresponds to areas of the touch screen (30). When the user touches an area on the screen a camera is selected for optimal shooting of the designated location (col. 5, lines 16-21). When the selected camera is not in not already pointed at the designated location it will rotate towards the location (col. 5, lines 18-21). Thus, the camera is panned. The Examiner is interpreting the claim as meaning that a determination is made as to whether or not a selected camera needs to be panned on the basis of an angle between an imaginary line connecting the center of the camera symbol with the designated location and an imaginary line connecting the center of the camera symbol with the direction in which the camera is currently oriented. The Morgan reference states that the wedge (64) indicates the field of view of the camera (62) and if it is not already pointed at the asset (a.k.a. on the basis of an angle between an imaginary line connecting the center of the camera symbol with the designated location and an imaginary line connecting the center of the camera symbol with the direction in which the camera is currently oriented), it will start to rotate towards it (a.k.a. camera will be panned)(col. 5, lines 18-20).

Re claim 3, the map display (fig. 2: 50) stores information about the positions of obstructions existing in the line of sight of the cameras (fig. 2: 74; col. 5, lines 49-56). Cameras undesirable for shooting the location are eliminated from candidates considered by the camera selection algorithm (col. 6, lines 39-46).

Re claim 4, the wall (fig. 2: 74) is an obstruction in the view of the cameras (col. 5, lines 49-56). The only camera that is capable of viewing the safe (fig. 2: 70) is camera (72) because the wall (74) obstructs the view of the other cameras (fig. 2: 3, 24). Therefore, the wall (74) is displayed by cameras (3, 24) when the area around the safe (70) is selected by the user.

Re claim 10, images captured by the camera selected by the determination section are displayed greater than images captured by other cameras. The images are displayed according to a priority scheme. When all monitors are active, the monitor with the lowest priority camera image will be replaced with the new higher priority image provided by the determination section (col. 6, lines 53-63). The term "greater" is very broad, therefore this reads on the claim.

Re claim 12, Morgan discloses in figure 2 a user interface for a camera selection and positioning system. Images are taken by remote cameras (fig. 1: 34,36) and displayed on video monitors (fig. 1: 22,24,26,28) (col. 3, lines 20-33). A camera control area display section (fig. 2: 30) displays camera symbols (fig. 2: 24,3,32) representing the locations of the cameras and wedges (fig. 2: 64,68) indicating the directions in which the cameras are oriented (col. 5, lines 11-20). The map (fig. 2: 50) has a coordinate pattern that corresponds to areas of the touch screen (30). When the user touches an area on the screen a camera is selected for optimal shooting of the designated location (col. 5, lines 16-21). Morgan also states that camera selection is determined by an algorithm that first identifies which camera or cameras can "see" the desired area (col.

6, lines 39-41). It is inherent that the algorithm must to through a sequence according to the arrangement of the cameras in order to examine each of the cameras and determine which cameras can "see" the desired area. Zoom information is then calculated for each selected camera to present a constant view height (col. 6, lines 39-52). Therefore, since camera selection is determined by an algorithm that identifies which cameras can "see" the desired area and zoom information is then calculated for each selected camera it can be seen that the zoom scale of each camera examined as being optimal for shooting (a.k.a. the cameras that can "see" the desired area) is determined in a sequence in which the cameras are arranged.

Re claim 22, Morgan discloses in figure 2 a user interface for a camera selection and positioning system. Images are taken by remote cameras (fig. 1: 34,36) and displayed on video monitors (fig. 1: 22,24,26,28) (col. 3, lines 20-33). A camera control area display section (fig. 2: 30) displays camera symbols (fig. 2: 24,3,32) representing the locations of the cameras and wedges (fig. 2: 64,68) indicating the directions in which the cameras are oriented (col. 5, lines 11-20). The map (fig. 2: 50) has a coordinate pattern that corresponds to areas of the touch screen (30). When the user touches an area on the screen a camera is selected for optimal shooting of the designated location (col. 5, lines 16-21). When the selected camera is not in not already pointed at the designated location it will rotate towards the location (col. 5, lines 18-21). Thus, the camera is panned. Morgan also states that camera selection is determined by an algorithm that first identifies which camera or cameras can "see" the

desired area (col. 6, lines 39-41). It is inherent that the algorithm must to through a sequence according to the arrangement of the cameras in order to examine each of the cameras and determine which cameras can "see" the desired area. These camera views are immediately routed to available video monitors (col. 6, lines 41-42). Therefore, since camera selection is determined by an algorithm that identifies which cameras can "see" the desired area and the selected camera views are immediately routed to available video monitors it can be seen that images captured by each camera examined as being optimal for shooting (a.k.a. the cameras that can "see" the desired area) are displayed at respective scales in a sequence in which the cameras are arranged.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-9, 11, 13, 15-21 allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Prior art fails to show an angular-shift-time calculation section for calculating the time required for the camera to pan toward the designated location and a focus-shift-time calculation or a zoom-shift-time calculation for calculating the time required for the camera to attain a focus or to zoom on the designated location as stated in independent

claims 5, 9, 17, and 21. Claim 6 depends on claim 5 and claim 18 depends on claim 17, thus they are also allowable.

Prior art fails to show that the camera-to-be-operated determination section determines a camera to be operated based on the angle between the current shooting direction of the camera and the direction of an imaginary line connecting the designated location with the center of the camera symbol as stated in independent claims 7 and 13. Claim 8 depends on claim 7 and claims 11, 15, 16, 19, and 20 depend on claim 13, thus they are also allowable.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kelly L. Jerabek whose telephone number is 703-305-8659. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber can be reached on 703-305-4929. The fax phone number for submitting all Official communications is 703-872-9306. The fax phone number for submitting informal communications such as drafts, proposed amendments, etc., may be faxed directly to the Examiner at 703-746-3059.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KLJ

NGOC-YEN YU
PRIMARY EXAMINER